

STATE OF WISCONSIN

Senate Journal

1985 September Special Session

WEDNESDAY, October 16, 1985

12:09 P.M.

The senate met.

The senate was called to order by Fred A. Risser, president of the senate.

By request of Senator Cullen, with unanimous consent, the roll call, prayer and pledge of the Regular Session will be applied to the Special Session.

The president of the Senate, Fred A. Risser, declared a quorum present.

CALENDAR OF OCTOBER 16

Senate Bill 2, Special Session

Relating to making an appropriation for technology development grants.

Read a second time.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 1?

1. Senator Davis moved rejection of senate amendment

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 1?
The motion did not prevail.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 1?
Adopted.

Ordered to a third reading.

By request of Senator Cullen, with unanimous consent, the bill was considered for final action at this time.

Senate Bill 2, Special Session

Read a third time.

The ayes and noes were required and the vote was: ayes, 30; noes, 3; absent or not voting, 0; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Adelman, Andrea, Chilsen, Chvala, Cullen, Czarnezki, Davis, Ellis, Engeleiter, Feingold, George, Hanaway, Harsdorf, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lee, Llean, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Otte, Plewa, Risser, Roshell, Rude, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 30.

Noes -- Senators Lasee, Norquist and Stitt -- 3.
Absent or not voting -- None.

So the bill passed.

By request of Senator Cullen, with unanimous consent, the senate recessed until 2:45 P.M.

12:20 P.M.

RECESS

2:45 P.M.

The senate reconvened.

QUORUM CALL

Senator Cullen called the attention of the chair to the possible lack of a quorum.

The roll was called and the following senators answered to their names:

Senators Adelman, Chilsen, Cullen, Czarnezki, Davis, Ellis, Feingold, George, Hanaway, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lee, Llean, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Norquist, Otte, Plewa, Risser, Rude, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 27.

Absent -- Senators Andrea, Chvala, Engeleiter, Harsdorf, Lasee and Roshell -- 6.

Absent with leave -- None.

Senate Bill 4, Special Session

Relating to creating a center for international agribusiness marketing in the department of agriculture, trade and consumer protection and making an appropriation.

Read a second time.

Senate amendment 1 offered by Senator George.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 1?
Adopted.

Ordered to a third reading.

By request of Senator Cullen, with unanimous consent, the bill was considered for final action at this time.

Senate Bill 4, Special Session

Read a third time.

The ayes and noes were required and the vote was: ayes, 32; noes, 1; absent or not voting, 0; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Adelman, Andrea, Chilsen, Chvala, Cullen, Czarnezki, Davis, Ellis, Engeleiter, Feingold, George, Hanaway, Harsdorf, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasee, Lee, Llean, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Otte, Plewa, Risser, Roshell, Rude, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 32.

Noes -- Senator Norquist -- 1.

Absent or not voting -- None.

So the bill passed.

Senate Bill 6, Special Session

Relating to creating an exemption from nonresident tuition at the university of Wisconsin system for certain persons relocated to this state by their employers.

Read a second time.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 1?
Adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 2?
Adopted.

Senate amendment 3 offered by Senators Engeleiter and Davis.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 3?
Adopted.

Ordered to a third reading.

By request of Senator Cullen, with unanimous consent, the bill was considered for final action at this time.

Senate Bill 6, Special Session

Read a third time and passed.

Senate Bill 7, Special Session

Relating to authorizing the state superintendent of public instruction to make grants to school boards to fund education for employment projects, providing for a study and making an appropriation.

Read a second time.

The question was: Shall the bill be indefinitely postponed?

The motion did not prevail.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 1?

Senate amendment 1 to senate amendment 1 offered by Senator Davis.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 1 to senate amendment 1?
Adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 1?
Adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 2?
Adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 3?
Adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 4?
Adopted.

Senate amendment 5 offered by Senator Cullen

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 5?
Adopted.

Senate amendment 6 offered by Senator Norquist.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 6?
Adopted.

Senate amendment 7 offered by Senator Davis.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 7?

7. Senator Cullen moved rejection of senate amendment

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 7?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 21; noes, 12; absent or not voting, 0; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Chilsen, Chvala, Cullen, Ellis, Feingold, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasee, Lorman, Moen, Norquist, Otte, Plewa, Roshell, Rude, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 21.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Czarnezki, Davis, Engeleiter, George, Hanaway, Harsdorf, Lee, Lekan, McCallum, Risser and Stitt -- 12.

Absent or not voting -- None.

So the motion prevailed.

Ordered to a third reading.

By request of Senator Cullen, with unanimous consent, the bill was considered for final action at this time.

Senate Bill 7, Special Session

Read a third time.

The ayes and noes were required and the vote was: ayes, 23; noes, 10; absent or not voting, 0; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Chilsen, Chvala, Cullen, Davis, Engeleiter, Feingold, Hanaway, Harsdorf, Kincaid, Kreul, Lekan, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Otte, Plewa, Risser, Rude, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 23.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Czarnezki, Ellis, George, Helbach, Lasee, Lee, Norquist, Roshell and Stitt -- 10.

Absent or not voting -- None.

So the bill passed.

Senate Bill 10, Special Session

Relating to awards of costs to individuals and small businesses and making an appropriation.

Read a second time.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 1?
Adopted.

Senate amendment 1 to senate amendment 2 offered by Senator Feingold.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 1 to senate amendment 2?
Adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 2?
Adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 3?
Adopted.

Senator Feingold raised the point of order that senate amendment 3 was not germane.

The chair ruled the point of order well taken.

Senate amendment 4 offered by Senator Strohl.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 4?

Senator Ulichny raised the point of order that senate amendment 4 was not germane.

The chair ruled the point of order well taken.

Ordered to a third reading.

By request of Senator Cullen, with unanimous consent, the bill was considered for final action at this time.

Senate Bill 10, Special Session

Read a third time.

The ayes and noes were required and the vote was: ayes, 31; noes, 2; absent or not voting, 0; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Adelman, Andrea, Chilsen, Chvala, Cullen, Czarnezki, Davis, Ellis, Engeleiter, Feingold, George, Hanaway, Harsdorf, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasee, Leraan, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Otte, Plewa, Risser, Roshell, Rude, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 31.

Noes -- Senators Lee and Norquist -- 2.

Absent or not voting -- None.

So the bill passed.

Senate Bill 11, Special Session

Relating to determination of the value and equalized value of agricultural land, information required to be included on the real estate transfer form, requiring the department of revenue to promulgate rules and making appropriations.

Read a second time.

Senate amendment 1 offered by Senator George.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 1? Adopted.

Senate amendment 2 offered by Senators Harsdorf and Moen.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 2? Adopted.

Senate amendment 3 offered by Senators Harsdorf and Moen.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 3? Adopted.

Ordered to a third reading.

By request of Senator Cullen, with unanimous consent, the bill was considered for final action at this time.

Senate Bill 11, Special Session

Read a third time.

The ayes and noes were required and the vote was: ayes, 33; noes, 0; absent or not voting, 0; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Adelman, Andrea, Chilsen, Chvala, Cullen, Czarnezki, Davis, Ellis, Engeleiter, Feingold, George, Hanaway, Harsdorf, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul,

Lasee, Lee, Leraan, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Norquist, Otte, Plewa, Risser, Roshell, Rude, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 33.

Noes -- None.

Absent or not voting -- None.

So the bill passed.

By request of Senator Cullen, with unanimous consent, all action was ordered immediately messaged.

By request of Senator Cullen, with unanimous consent, the senate recessed until 4:33 P.M.

3:51 P.M.

RECESS

4:33 P.M.

The senate reconvened.

Senate Bill 12

Relating to regulating major withdrawals from waters of the state, granting rule-making authority and making appropriations.

Read a second time.

Senate substitute amendment 1 offered by Senator Davis.

The question was: Adoption of senate substitute amendment 1?

By request of Senator Theno, with unanimous consent, senate substitute amendment 1 was laid on the table.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 1?

By request of Senator Strohl, with unanimous consent, senate amendment 1 was laid on the table.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 2? Adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 3? Adopted.

Senate amendment 4 offered by Senators Davis, Andrea, Stitt, Theno and Strohl.

Senate amendment 1 to senate amendment 4 offered by Senators Davis, Andrea, Stitt, Theno and Strohl.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 1 to senate amendment 4? Adopted.

Adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 4? Adopted.

Ordered to a third reading.

By request of Senator Strohl, with unanimous consent, the bill was considered for final action at this time.

Senate Bill 12, Special Session

Read a third time.

The ayes and noes were required and the vote was: ayes, 33; noes, 0; absent or not voting, 0; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Adelman, Andrea, Chilsen, Chvala, Cullen, Czarnezki, Davis, Ellis, Engeleiter, Feingold, George, Hanaway, Harsdorf, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasee, Lee, Leean, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Norquist, Otte, Plewa, Risser, Roshell, Rude, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 33.

Noes -- None.

Absent or not voting -- None.

So the bill passed.

By request of the president of the senate, with unanimous consent, the Senate returned to the fourth order of business.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

The joint committee on Finance reports and recommends:

Senate Bill 14, Special Session

Relating to the formation of holding companies by certain public utilities and the regulation of certain holding companies by the public service commission, granting rule-making authority and making an appropriation.

Adoption of senate amendment 2:

Ayes, 12 -- Senators George, Roshell, Strohl, Norquist, Helbach, Chvala and Davis, Representatives Schneider, Metz, Travis, Kunicki and Panzer;

Noes, 3 -- Senator Stitt, Representatives Nelsen and Prosser.

Adoption of senate amendment 5:

Ayes, 12 -- Senators George, Strohl, Norquist, Helbach, Chvala and Davis, Representatives Schneider, Metz, Travis, Kunicki, Panzer and Prosser;

Noes, 3 -- Senators Roshell and Stitt, Representative Nelsen.

Introduction and adoption of senate amendment 6:

Ayes, 16 -- Senators George, Roshell, Strohl, Norquist, Helbach, Chvala, Stitt and Davis, Representatives Schneider, Metz, Jauch, Travis, Kunicki, Nelsen, Panzer and Prosser;

Noes, 0 -- None.

Introduction and adoption of senate amendment 7:

Ayes, 14 -- Senators George, Roshell, Norquist, Helbach, Chvala, Stitt and Davis, Representatives Schneider, Metz, Jauch, Travis, Kunicki, Panzer and Prosser;

Noes, 2 -- Senator Strohl and Representative Nelsen.

Passage as amended:

Ayes, 11 -- Senators George, Roshell, Strohl, Helbach, Stitt and Davis, Representatives Jauch, Travis, Nelsen, Panzer and Prosser;

Noes, 5 -- Senators Norquist and Chvala, Representatives Schneider, Metz and Kunicki.

GARY R. GEORGE

Chair

By request of Senator Cullen, with unanimous consent, all action was ordered immediately messaged.

Senate Bill 14, Special Session

Relating to the formation of holding companies by certain public utilities and the regulation of certain holding companies by the public service commission, granting rule-making authority and making an appropriation.

Read a second time.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 1?

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 1.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 1?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 25; noes, 8; absent or not voting, 0; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Chilsen, Cullen, Davis, Engeleiter, George, Hanaway, Harsdorf, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasee, Leean, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Norquist, Otte, Plewa, Roshell, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 25.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Chvala, Czarnezki, Ellis, Feingold, Lee, Risser and Rude -- 8.

Absent or not voting -- None.

So the motion prevailed.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 2? Adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 3?

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 3.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 3?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 21; noes, 12; absent or not voting, 0; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Cullen, Davis, Engeleiter, Hanaway, Harsdorf, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasee, Leean, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Otte, Roshell, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 21.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Chilsen, Chvala, Czarnezki, Ellis, Feingold, George, Lee, Norquist, Plewa, Risser and Rude -- 12.

Absent or not voting -- None.

So the motion prevailed.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 4?

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [October 16, 1985]

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 4.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 4?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 21; noes, 11; absent or not voting, 1; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Cullen, Davis, Engeleiter, George, Hanaway, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasee, Lekan, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Plewa, Roshell, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 21.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Chilsen, Chvala, Czarnezki, Ellis, Feingold, Lee, Norquist, Otte, Risser and Rude -- 11.

Absent or not voting -- Senator Harsdorf -- 1.

So the motion prevailed.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 5? Adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 6? Adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 7? Adopted.

Senate amendment 8 offered by Senators Rude, Ellis, Feingold, Lee and Chvala.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 8?

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 8.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 8?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 24; noes, 9; absent or not voting, 0; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Chilsen, Cullen, Davis, Engeleiter, George, Hanaway, Harsdorf, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasee, Lekan, Lorman, Moen, Norquist, Otte, Plewa, Roshell, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 24.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Chvala, Czarnezki, Ellis, Feingold, Lee, McCallum, Risser and Rude -- 9.

Absent or not voting -- None.

So the motion prevailed.

Senate amendment 9 offered by Senators Chvala and Lee.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 9?

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 9.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 9?

By request of Senator Chvala, with unanimous consent, senate amendment 17 was considered at this time.

Senate amendment 17 offered by Senators Chvala, Feingold, Czarnezki and Lee.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 17?

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 17.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 17?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 19; noes, 14; absent or not voting, 0; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Cullen, Davis, Engeleiter, Hanaway, Helbach, Kincaid, Lasee, Lekan, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Otte, Plewa, Roshell, Stitt, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 19.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Chilsen, Chvala, Czarnezki, Ellis, Feingold, George, Harsdorf, Kreul, Lee, Norquist, Risser, Rude and Strohl -- 14.

Absent or not voting -- None.

So the motion prevailed.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 9?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 22; noes, 11; absent or not voting, 0; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Chilsen, Cullen, Davis, Engeleiter, George, Hanaway, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasee, Lekan, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Otte, Plewa, Roshell, Stitt, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 22.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Chvala, Czarnezki, Ellis, Feingold, Harsdorf, Lee, Norquist, Risser, Rude and Strohl -- 11.

Absent or not voting -- None.

So the motion prevailed.

Senate amendment 10 offered by Senators Chvala and Lee.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 10?

By request of Senator Chvala, with unanimous consent, senate amendment 10 was returned to the author.

Senate amendment 11 offered by Senators Lee and Chvala.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 11?

By request of Senator Lee, with unanimous consent, senate amendment 11 was returned to the author.

Senate amendment 12 offered by Senators Rude, Chvala, Czarnezki and Lee.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 12?

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 12.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 12?

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [October 16, 1985]

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 21; noes, 11; absent or not voting, 1; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Cullen, Davis, Engeleiter, Hanaway, Harsdorf, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasee, Llean, Lorman, Moen, Otte, Plewa, Roshell, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 21.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Chilsen, Chvala, Czarneski, Feingold, George, Lee, McCallum, Norquist, Risser and Rude -- 11.

Absent or not voting -- Senator Ellis -- 1.

So the motion prevailed.

Senate amendment 13 offered by Senators Lee and Chvala.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 13?

By request of Senator Lee, with unanimous consent, senate amendment 13 was returned to the author.

Senate amendment 14 offered by Senators Chvala, Lee, Rude, Czarneski and Feingold.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 14?

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 14.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 14?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 24; noes, 8; absent or not voting, 1; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Chilsen, Cullen, Davis, Engeleiter, George, Hanaway, Harsdorf, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasee, Llean, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Otte, Plewa, Roshell, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 24.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Chvala, Czarneski, Feingold, Lee, Norquist, Risser and Rude -- 8.

Absent or not voting -- Senator Ellis -- 1.

So the motion prevailed.

Senate amendment 15 offered by Senators Chvala, Lee, Rude, Czarneski and Feingold.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 15?

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 15.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 15?

Senator Norquist in the chair.

6:14 P.M.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 15?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 24; noes, 9; absent or not voting, 0; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Chilsen, Cullen, Davis, Engeleiter, George, Hanaway, Harsdorf, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasee, Llean, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Otte, Plewa, Roshell, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 24.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Chvala, Czarneski, Ellis, Feingold, Lee, Norquist, Risser and Rude -- 9.

Absent or not voting -- None.

So the motion prevailed.

Senate amendment 16 offered by Senators Chvala, Czarneski, Lee and Feingold.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 16?

Senator Strohl moved rejection of senate amendment 16.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 16?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 24; noes, 8; absent or not voting, 1; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Chilsen, Cullen, Davis, Engeleiter, George, Hanaway, Harsdorf, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasee, Llean, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Otte, Plewa, Roshell, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 24.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Chvala, Czarneski, Feingold, Lee, Norquist, Risser and Rude -- 8.

Absent or not voting -- Senator Ellis -- 1.

So the motion prevailed.

Senate amendment 18 offered by Senators Lee, Chvala, Czarneski, Rude and Feingold.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 18?

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 18.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 18?

By request of Senator Lee, with unanimous consent, senate amendment 18 was placed after senate amendment 26.

Senate amendment 19 offered by Senators Chvala, Lee, Rude, Czarneski and Feingold.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 19?

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 19.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 19?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 21; noes, 9; absent or not voting, 3; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Chilsen, Davis, Engeleiter, George, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasec, Leean, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Otte, Plewa, Roshell, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 21.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Chvala, Czarnezki, Ellis, Feingold, Lee, Norquist, Risser and Rude -- 9.

Absent or not voting -- Senators Cullen, Hanaway and Harsdorf -- 3.

So the motion prevailed.

Senate amendment 20 offered by Senator Adelman.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 20?

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 20.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 20?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 19; noes, 12; absent or not voting, 2; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Chilsen, Cullen, Davis, Engeleiter, Helbach, Kreul, Lasec, Leean, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Otte, Plewa, Roshell, Stitt, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 19.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Chvala, Czarnezki, Ellis, Feingold, George, Kincaid, Lee, Norquist, Risser, Rude and Strohl -- 12.

Absent or not voting -- Senators Hanaway and Harsdorf -- 2.

So the motion prevailed.

Senate amendment 21 offered by Senators Feingold, Chvala and Czarnezki.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 21?

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 21.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 21?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 20; noes, 11; absent or not voting, 2; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Chilsen, Davis, George, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasec, Leean, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Otte, Plewa, Roshell, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 20.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Chvala, Cullen, Czarnezki, Ellis, Engeleiter, Feingold, Lee, Norquist, Risser and Rude -- 11.

Absent or not voting -- Senators Hanaway and Harsdorf -- 2.

So the motion prevailed.

Senate amendment 22 offered by Senators Lee and Chvala.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 22?

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 22.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 22?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 21; noes, 10; absent or not voting, 2; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Chilsen, Cullen, Davis, Engeleiter, George, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasec, Leean, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Otte, Plewa, Roshell, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 21.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Chvala, Czarnezki, Ellis, Feingold, Helbach, Lee, Norquist, Risser and Rude -- 10.

Absent or not voting -- Senators Hanaway and Harsdorf -- 2.

So the motion prevailed.

Senate amendment 23 offered by Senators Rude, Czarnezki, Chvala, Lee and Feingold.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 23?

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 23.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 23?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 18; noes, 12; absent or not voting, 3; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Cullen, Davis, George, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Leean, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Plewa, Roshell, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 18.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Chilsen, Chvala, Czarnezki, Ellis, Engeleiter, Feingold, Lasec, Lee, Norquist, Risser and Rude -- 12.

Absent or not voting -- Senators Hanaway, Harsdorf and Otte -- 3.

So the motion prevailed.

Senate amendment 24 offered by Senators Chvala, Czarnezki and Lee.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 24?

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 24.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 24?

The motion prevailed.

Senate amendment 25 offered by Senators Chvala, Czarnezki and Lee.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 25?

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [October 16, 1985]

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 25.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 25?

The motion prevailed.

Senate amendment 26 offered by Senators Chvala, Lee and Czarnezki.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 26?

Senator Ulichny moved rejection of senate amendment 26.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 26?

The motion prevailed.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 18?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 21; noes, 10; absent or not voting, 2; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Chilsen, Cullen, Davis, Engeleiter, George, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasee, Lekan, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Otte, Roshell, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 21.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Chvala, Czarnezki, Ellis, Feingold, Lee, Norquist, Plewa, Risser and Rude -- 10.

Absent or not voting -- Senators Hanaway and Harsdorf -- 2.

So the motion prevailed.

Senator Risser moved that **Senate Bill 14, Special Session** be indefinitely postponed?

The question was: Shall the bill be indefinitely postponed?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 9; noes, 24; absent or not voting, 0; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Adelman, Chvala, Czarnezki, Ellis, Feingold, Lee, Norquist, Risser and Rude -- 9.

Noes -- Senators Andrea, Chilsen, Cullen, Davis, Engeleiter, George, Hanaway, Harsdorf, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasee, Lekan, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Otte, Plewa, Roshell, Stitt, Strohl, Theno, Ulichny and Van Sistine -- 24.

Absent or not voting -- None.

So the motion did not prevail.

The president of the senate in the chair.

7:50 P.M.

Ordered to a third reading.

By request of Senator Cullen, with unanimous consent, the bill was considered for final action at this time.

Senate Bill 14, Special Session

Read a third time.

The ayes and noes were required and the vote was: ayes, 23; noes, 10; absent or not voting, 0; as follows:

Ayes -- Senators Andrea, Chilsen, Cullen, Davis, Engeleiter, George, Hanaway, Harsdorf, Helbach, Kincaid, Kreul, Lasee, Lekan, Lorman, McCallum, Moen, Otte, Plewa, Roshell, Stitt, Strohl, Theno and Ulichny -- 23.

Noes -- Senators Adelman, Chvala, Czarnezki, Ellis, Feingold, Lee, Norquist, Risser, Rude and Van Sistine -- 10.

Absent or not voting -- None.

So the bill passed.

By request of Senator Cullen, with unanimous consent, all action was ordered immediately messaged.

By request of Senator Helbach, with unanimous consent, the senate adjourned in honor of Senators Cullen, Engeleiter and Risser on Boss' Day.

Upon motion of Senator Cullen the senate adjourned until 10:00 A.M. Thursday, October 17.

8:48 P.M.